

REMARKS

I. INTRODUCTION AND STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND SPECIFICATION

Claims 3-9, 23, 18-20, and 22-23 are currently pending in the present application. Claims 3, 12 and 18 have been amended. Claims 1-2, 10-11, 13-17, and 21 have been cancelled. Claims 22-23 have been added. No new matter has been added. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as written are in proper form for allowance and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The specification has been amended to make it consistent with the language of new claims 22 and 23. No new matter has been added as the language of claim 22 literally corresponds to that of claims 1-2, 10, and 11 (now cancelled) and claim 23 corresponds to claims 1, 2, 10, and 17 (now cancelled).

II. DRAWINGS

The Examiner has objected to Figure 1 on the basis it fails to include the legend "PRIOR ART". Accordingly, Applicant is submitting a revised Figure 1, thus rendering this ground of rejection moot.

III. ISSUES UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. More specifically, the Examiner states that there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "said first and second moulded body parts" in line 3. Claim 18 has now been amended to depend from claim 23 which specifically recites this feature, thus rendering this ground of rejection moot.

IV. ISSUES UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3, 9, 10, and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Levitt. Claims 1, 10, and 13 have been cancelled, thereby rendering the ground of rejection with respect to these claims moot.

Claim 3 (from which claim 9 depends) has been amended to now depend from new claim 22 which, as noted above, includes the limitation of claims 1-2, 10, and 11 (now cancelled). AS claims 2 and 11 were not included in the Examiner's rejection, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 3 and 9 has also been rendered moot.

V. ISSUES UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 4 and 6-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levitt in view of Straw. Claims 4 and 6-8 ultimately depend from claim 3 which now depends from new claim 22. As noted, claim 22 includes the limitations of claim 1-2, 10, and 11 (now cancelled). Since these claims were not included in the Examiner's rejection, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejection has been rendered moot.

VI. ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner notes that claims 11, 12, and 17 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. As the substance of these claims has now been incorporated into new claims 22 and 23 from which the remaining claims ultimately depend, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims are now allowable.

VII. CONCLUSION

No fees or extensions of time are believed to be due in connection with this amendment; however, consider this a request for any extension inadvertently omitted, and charge any additional fees to Deposit Account No. 26-0084. Any deficiency or overpayment should be charged or credited to Deposit Account 26-0084.

Reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



WENDY K. MARSH, Reg. No. 39,705
McKEE, VOORHEES & SEASE, P.L.C.
801 Grand Avenue, Suite 3200
Des Moines, Iowa 50309-2721
Phone No: (515) 288-3667
Fax No: (515) 288-1338
CUSTOMER NO: 22885

Attorneys of Record

- WKM/bjh

Enclosure: Drawings